DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 838 FL 026 113

AUTHOR Burningham, Lisa A.

TITLE Teaching ESL as Policy or Humanitarian Effort: A School District Case Study.

PUB DATE 1999-03-00

NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (21st, Stamford, CT, March 6-9, 1999).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Ideology; *Language Minorities; *Language Planning; *Limited English Speaking; Politics of Education; *Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

This case study explores language policy and planning regarding language minority students as they affect administrators and teachers. Two research questions are discussed: (1) What are the ideologies influencing administrative decisions concerning alternative language planning? and (2) What are secondary teachers willing to do in order to better meet the needs of language minority students in the areas of language and curriculum adjustments, social inclusion of language minority students, and additional English-as-Second-Language training? The study concludes that given typical administrator and teacher ideologies and attitudes toward language minority students, which are guided by monolingualism and individualism, a formal language policy based on academic research is essential if the needs of language minority students are to be met. Training and education for both teachers and administrators is essential. A language plan should also address the responsibilities of teachers to make the necessary curriculum and language adjustments; this need is urgent given findings that many teachers feel they have not been trained to effectively instruct language minority students. This paper includes a list of data tables detailing the responses of administrators and teachers to various questions related to the primary research questions. (Contains 17 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 838

Teaching ESL as Policy or Humanitarian Effort:

A School District Case Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lisa A. Burningham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Lisa A. Burningham
Brigham Young University

presented at
AAAL 1999 Stamford, Connecticut

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL026113

Why a Language Policy is Necessary

A new student approaches his junior high English teacher with an add slip and a questioning look on his face. The teacher assigns him one of the remaining seats on the back row and gives him a few handouts outlining classroom procedures. The boy nods, so the teacher continues with classroom instruction. A few weeks into the term, the teacher learns that the boy has difficulty reading and writing in English even though his conversational English does not reveal his unique instructional needs. Although the placement counselor knew of the student's special needs, the teacher was not told. The teacher feels guilty for not helping the student from the beginning, but mostly she feels guilty because she possess few materials to help him, knows limited instructional strategies that meet his situation, and has even less time to devote to his particular needs.

As this opening scenario describes, many schools have experienced an increase of language minority (LM) students, but administrators and teachers are unprepared to adequately serve these students in terms of training and programs. Many public schools in Utah are currently facing the challenges of educating growing LM populations. When LM students make up the minority of students, administrators and school boards must decide which language programs and policies best meet the needs of their school population. These resolutions are often determined by factors other than the linguistic, cultural, social, and academic needs of the students (Kaplan, 1992). Instead, factors such as limited ESL/bilingual funding resources, social views of minority languages and populations, and individual language ideologies influence decisions about alternative language services. The degree of acceptance for a minority language in a particular region influences the political practices governing education. Consequently,

language education is influenced by social and political biases more than linguistic and educational research (McGroarty, 1997).

One of the challenges facing educators is training teachers to meet the unique needs of LM students. Not only do teachers not feel qualified to instruct LM student, but they may also not feel responsible for LM students placed in their mainstream classroom (Guinn, 1996). Utah educators are being required to address language policy and planning. As the teacher involved in the opening scenario, I intend to focus on language policy and planning (LPP) in the secondary schools of one suburban Utah school district. It is not the intention of this study to address all the factors involved in comprehensive LPP. Rather, it is the purpose of this study to explore two factors involving the major constituents of any public school—administrators and teachers. This study is designed to investigate the following research questions:

- What are the ideologies influencing administrative decisions concerning alternative language planning?
- What are secondary teachers willing to do in order to better meet the needs of LM students in the following areas: language and curriculum adjustments, social inclusion of LM students, and additional ESL training?

Literature Review

In order to frame the role of administrators and teachers in LPP in this Utah secondary education setting, the literature on LPP involving language-in-education, common language ideologies, and teacher attitudes will be reviewed.

Language policy consists of official decisions and social practices which relate to language education and use, as well as the planning of language acquisition and practice (McGroarty, 1997). Contrary to the ideas of many educators, language-in-education is not

restricted to the teaching of English. Rather, language planning "must be perceived as implicating a wide range of languages and a range of modifications occurring simultaneously over the set of languages in the environment" (Kaplan, 1994, p. 4). Making English instruction a precedence implies that other languages are to some degree subordinate to English. Moreover, LPP does not solely involve linguistic changes but also social, economical, and political considerations (Judd, 1992; Wiley & Lukes, 1996).

At times, language-in-education policy is implicit because "it is difficult to isolate, or it may never have been clearly articulated in the first place (Judd, 1992, p. 169). Whether the policy is implicit or explicit, all schools/districts have a language policy, and for that language-in-education policy to truly be effective, it must consider the broad range of issues influencing LPP.

Since language is not only a means of communicating, but also a social behavior, societies maintain ideologies, or beliefs, about a language and the speakers of that language. Cobarrubias (1983) further explains that "language ideologies reflect a mode of treatment of one language group with respect to another and ordinarily involve judgements as to what is right or wrong" (p. 63). As members of the larger society, judgements by local schools/districts regarding language-in-education reflect society's language ideologies (Handscombe, 1989). Desires to maintain linguistic dominance, views of English monolingualism, and attitudes of individualism are ideologies that each shape a school's administration and influence language-in-education policy.

Language ideologies and lack of language tolerance perpetuate the social hierarchy in part based on linguistic ability. Thus, "the dominant groups succeed in attributing the status of language to their own variety while ascribing the status of dialect to those of others" (Wiley &

Lukes, 1996. p. 514). The ability to speak English, and furthermore the standard variety of English, allows the speakers a certain degree of power because mastering standard varieties of English provides access to employment, education, good grades, and economic advantages. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p.13) argues that "the ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources between groups . . . are . . . defined on the basis of language." This type of bias, called *linguicism*, is a major factor in language-in-education decisions.

A common solution to the inequality which results from linguicism is to teach LM minority students English. According to this idea, non-English speaking individuals need to learn English as quickly as possible in order to function in an English-dominant society and reduce inequality. In other words, bilingualism or multilingualism is an obstacle that governments and education must overcome. Tollefson (1991) describes the danger of this thinking:

> The policy of requiring everyone to learn a single dominant language is widely seen as a common-sense solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies. The appeal of this assumption is such that monolingualism is seen as a solution to linguistic inequality. If linguistic minorities learn the dominant language, so the argument goes, then they will not suffer economic and social inequality. The assumption is an example of an ideology, which refers to normally unconscious assumptions that come to be seen as common sense… such assumptions justify exclusionary policies and sustain inequality (p. 10).

Implicit in the monolingual ideology is the concept of subtractive bilingualism which holds that language learners will replace their native language with the language of the dominant culture (Ellis, 1994). A monolinguistic ideology denies that other languages are resources in society. Furthermore, monolingualism and linguicism have influenced many people to perceive

LM students as a "burden on resources" and a "threat to their status as speakers of the dominant language and as members of the dominant culture" (Lucas & Katz, 1994, p. 538).

This is not to suggest that learning English is not necessary. In her discussion on the benefits of mainstreaming LM students, Handscombe (1989) recognizes the need to teach English, but she, too, questions that teaching English is a simple solution to a complex problem. "Though the development of proficiency in English is undoubtedly a prerequisite in a school system which uses English as its primary language of instruction, other factors . . . must be taken into account" (p. 23). These other factors include differences in LM students' educational background, the ultimate level of English proficiency required, and the value the wider society places on the minority community. Not only does the monolinguistic ideal view minority languages as a problem to overcome, but it also fails to address all aspects of LM students' needs.

Another ideology discussed in relation to language implies that through personal application, individual ability, and sufficient effort one can improve one's social status. Along with this belief in self-improvement exists the correlating idea that failure is based on the individual's lack of desire and effort (Wiley & Lukes, 1996). This ideology of individualism suggests that failure is due to the learner's deficiencies rather than institutional or systemic problems. An example of this ideology is when educators' sole concern is to change learners' attitudes toward the target language and culture, rather than making school level adjustments. A sole focus on the learner's attitudes and contributions ignores factors that influence the learner, "such as how the dominant group treats learners of a particular linguistic and ethnic group as they attempt to learn the dominant language or how the learners perceive the dominant group ascribes status to them" (Wiley & Lukes, 1996, p. 516).

The ideologies of linguicism, monolingualism, and individualism influence individuals, such as school/district administrators and teachers, who in turn establish language-in-education policies and plans at the local, state, and national level. Thus, educators are more likely to be influenced by regional ideologies in the absence of an explicit language policy. When sociopolitical attitudes are not considered in LPP, "ideologies and implicit political values pass for theoretical frameworks" (Wiley & Lukes, 1996, p. 515). Furthermore, ideological differences about minority languages and their cultures produce inconsistent public opinions concerning language-in-education policies (McGroarty, 1997). Thus, the ideologies of the larger society are entangled in school/district administrative language-in-education decisions which must win support from the communities and constituents effected by these administrative decisions.

An important aspect of any language-in-education policy and plan is teachers who have the necessary training and willingness to achieve the policy goals set to serve LM students. Dicker (1996) in her research concerning language in schools, noted that many teachers feel uneasy about having LM students in their classes because they are uncertain of how to teach these students. They struggle with the focus of instruction and do not know if they should emphasize language or content instruction. Furthermore, Dicker concludes they feel unprepared to teach content to students who do not have the proficiency necessary to handle the subject materials.

An additional problem identified by Clair (1995) in her case study of mainstream teachers is that instructors who work with ESL students often do not want to receive necessary inservice instruction. In her interview with three mainstream classroom teachers (two at the elementary level and one at the secondary level), Clair concluded that teachers want "quick fixes" in regards to complex issues concerning ESL education. In other words, teachers want ready-made

materials for instructing ESL students rather than an understanding of second language acquisition and the social, political, and economic issues involved in educating this student population. Guinn (1996) found that another reason teachers refuse to certify in ESL is that ESL teachers are perceived to have a lower status than mainstream content teachers. The elementary teachers involved in her study felt they would be 'stuck' with LM students if they received ESL certification.

Even though teachers feel ambivalent about their role in teaching LM students, teachers are at the center of LPP. Teachers have the power to reject or sustain denigrating social ideologies about LM students. Often, teachers implement language policies without conscious awareness. Hornberger and Ricento suggest how teachers may support undesirable language policies:

> "They do so in many ways and on many levels; for example, teachers may internalize normative social attitudes toward speakers of nonofficial languages or nonstandard varieties of official languages, or they may believe that bilingual education programs disadvantage LM students. Further, the discourse of schools, communities, and states helps reinforce unstated beliefs so that teachers come to believe not only that what they are doing reflects explicit policies but that the policies are generally in the best interest of students" (1996, p. 417).

Not all teachers perpetuate negative language policies. On the contrary, teachers often support positive language policy that in turn promote a broader social change. Teachers challenge existing ideologies by valuing the social and cultural identity of LM students. In successful public school language programs evaluated by Faltis and Hudelson, teachers "demonstrated particular sensitivity to the realities and needs of the learners with whom they were working and engaged in teaching behavior that took their students into account" (1994, p. 463). In the same study, the authors suggest that when teachers work as a community, they can call into question language policy practices which socially and physically separate LM students

from native speaking students through ESL pull-out classes and other tracking methods. With their collaborative efforts, teachers can challenge the status quo which benefits certain students based on their linguistic abilities.

Accepting linguistic and cultural diversity, however, is not always the norm. Some LM teaching occurs from a separatist approach as when LM students are taught primarily outside mainstream classrooms. Programs which advocate a separatist approach to LM students "have often been a diminishing experience, not only for the students themselves and for their academic and social development, but also for the way in which the educational establishment has come to conceptualize ESL learners as a whole" (Clegg, 1996, p.3). As a result, the perceived status of ESL students and teachers has tended to be lower than those students in mainstream classes (Wiley & Lukes, 1996).

Another result of the separate provision for ESL students is that their specific language needs are focused on at the expense of their academic and social needs. In this view LM students' needs are reduced to their linguistic aspect only. Along the same lines of linguistic separatism and needs reduction, LM students are not viewed as part of the whole school but as a responsibility of the language teachers. The reduction in turn implies that language and cultural tolerance are not the responsibility of mainstream teachers and the entire school community but an aspect of ESL teachers only (Clegg, 1996). In sum, teacher willingness to adjust to meet LM students' needs, foster an inclusive social environment, and acquire additional ESL teacher training is an essential aspect of implementing any language-in-education plan.

In consideration of all that has been written and researched concerning LPP, there is still much that needs to done to determine the factors involved in language-in-education and their relationship to successfully serving LM students.

Research Design

In order to investigate language-in-education policy and planning in the secondary schools of one Utah school district, data were gathered regarding administrative ideologies and teacher attitudes.

Subjects

Administrators

The first category of subjects includes six administrators from this school district. Three of the administrators held positions as principals and one administrator worked as a vice principal in this district's secondary schools. The remaining two administrators were responsible for ESL planning and policy at the district level.

Teachers

The second category of subjects included all the teachers at one high school and one junior high school in the district being studied. Of the 108 teachers in these schools, 86 teachers—23 junior high teachers and 36 high school teachers—voluntarily completed the survey.

Data Collection and Analysis

For administrators, semi-structured interviews were conducted over a three week period of time during January and February of 1998. Analysis of recorded and written transcripts revealed 15 categories of attitudes and ideologies (see Table 1). Since it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss all response categories, the discussion will focus on those responses suggesting ideologies of monolingualism and individualism.

For teachers, the survey of teacher attitudes was distributed and collected over a one week period of time in January of 1998. Although participation was voluntary, principals at the

participating high school and junior high school encouraged teachers to participate in the teacher attitudes survey via e-mail messages to the teachers. The survey consisted of 17 statements to which responding teachers indicated agreement on an eight point Likert scale, where I meant *strongly disagree* and 8 meant *strongly agree*. The survey focused on four categories of questions: a) responsibility for making linguistic and curriculum adjustments, b) appropriateness of making linguistic and curriculum adjustments, c) social inclusion of LM students, and d) obtaining additional ESL training. The researcher analyzed the responses for means and frequency of responses.

Results

Administrative Interview

Regarding the ideology of English monolingualism, all administrators indicated the opposite view by stating that LM students were an asset to the district. Administrator #6 commented that, "There is a wonderful, wonderful, addition to our schools and culture from these children and from their families if it can be valued. If the education of these students can be seen as something that will benefit everybody. We see bits and pieces of it and hope that it will continue too." The response of administrator #3 suggests that LM students are an asset in terms of the opportunities they offer to other students in the school. "I think it's a great opportunity for students to get a flavor of other cultures, and to learn tolerance, and to be accepting of people who have different background than they have."

However, along with positive comments such as these, four of the six administrators commented that LM students do not speak enough English which suggests an orientation to subtractive bilingualism and the view of language diversity as a problem. In response to the question about the existence and need for maintenance of LM students' native languages,

administrator #1 stated, "No. There needs to be a point where you start to phase out the native language and phase in more English." Administrator #2 also reflected the belief that the student's native language needs to be replaced by English when he said, "Well, I just think that the entire family needs to be involved in, not necessarily the education, but the picking up of English as a second language. If the parents don't make the change, the kids will struggle twice as long before they do. . . Because kids are quick if they are forced to it. But we don't do that. We put them with 'samo'. They stay together in clusters, so they talk to one another in their native language, and they go home and that's all they talk or hear. So the small part of English they're getting doesn't help them for a long time. 'Til they're put in a situation where they have to." These comments imply that for some administrators, their decisions regarding language-in-education are influenced by the ideology of monolingualism.

Although not all administrators made comments suggesting the subtractive view of a second language, all administrators felt that public schools were not responsible for the maintenance of students' native languages. Four of the six administrators did, however, clarify that even though the school is not responsible for maintaining the native language, school personnel should value and acknowledge the native language of LM students. For example, administrator #2 related this incident: "Every time I see Robyn, I say, "Robyn, como esta'?" I know five things in Spanish. Why I'm doing that is I acknowledge his native language. I kid him and say, 'You're so much smarter than me because you speak two languages. You speak English and Spanish.' I don't think I am helping him maintain his native language. It's a plus. It's a plus for him. It is not a disadvantage."

In addition to the ideology of monolingualism discussed above, all administrators discussed the reasons for varied academic success of LM students in terms of the students

themselves, or the students' native cultures. Despite the fact that all six administrators acknowledge the lack of teacher training and ability to work effectively with LM students in the classroom, only one administrator suggested that the lack of success for some LM students may be due to the inadequacies of the language services in the district. Administrator #6 briefly suggested that some students may succeed more easily if they are in a classroom with a supportive teacher. The administrator said, "Maybe if they were in a different classroom. I don't know for sure."

Instead of looking within the system itself, administrators attributed the lack of academic success for some LM students to a variety of reasons such as culture, poor academic ability, personality, socioeconomic status, or lack of family involvement. In addition to the previous comment, administrator #6 also said, "I think in some respects, too, and I'm not putting down anyone else, European children come in and seem to tackle this better." The influence of culture was also indicated by administrator #4 who said, "I think it's culture related because they don't have that great an emphasis on education to begin with. A lot of those kids when they come into school, don't have good skills in their own language when they are 5 and 6 years old. There's been no instruction at home. There's no intention of reading to kids in Spanish let alone in English. I think it's culture."

Along with the culture, administrators #3 and #2 mention the family as a possible reason for the varied academic success of LM students. "I think it is a family cultural goal and support system. . . . The family culture is the key." Administrator #2 also commented, "This research on assets. Some kids come to school automatically with more assets than other kids based on their home, the kind of support they have, if people have read books to them, if they've been places. I don't think ESL kids are any different. Just 'cause they don't speak English, they're not all alike.

They come with the same. And some are just more capable. One thing I know is that different cultures have different kinds of environment in the home."

Administrator #5, on the other hand, mentioned the socioeconomic status of the family as a reason for varied academic success among LM students. "Well, I'll just be real simple. I think its their socioeconomic status. If you are a kid who comes out of a low income environment, whether you are an American or a Vietnamese, or Mexican kid then you're going to come out with not the kind of support and enrichment that a kid would need to be more facile in school. So I think it's a class issue." Administrator #1 mentioned personality and academic ability as reasons some LM students seem to succeed academically more than others. "There are a number of reasons: Personality. Whether they are extroverted or introverted people. Academic ability. We have kids that are ESL students that ought to be in special ed. classes and aren't."

Similar to the ideology of individualism, the administrators seem to be focusing on the learner's attitudes and contributions rather than the social and institutional factors influencing the learner. In addition to the ideological assumptions, every administrator acknowledged that there is no formal language policy in the district. Three of the administrators commented that their own philosophies influence the decisions they make regarding language-in-education because of the lack of a formal language policy and plan. For example, administrator #2 stated, "I don't think we have a real strong, firmly stated policy statement. . . . So, I don't know. I kind of operate from my own beliefs and I know our (school) board would want us to educate all kids and figure out the best way to do it." Along those same lines, administrator #3 commented, "Basically it's whatever you feel like as an humanitarian. As an individual."

These administrators' comments reveal their attitudes and ideologies regarding language and LM students. This evidence suggests that in the absence of a formal language-in-education

policy and plan, personal and regional ideologies influence administrative decisions about LM student education. When administrators approach LPP issues idiosyncratically, they leave room for greater variation across schools within the same district.

Teacher Attitude Survey

In general, the responses to this survey reveal that the teachers are uncertain of their responsibility for adjusting curriculum and/or language to meet the needs of LM students. This information is particularly important since LM students attend all mainstream classes, except for one period during the day, in the schools involved in this study. Although the responses suggest that content teachers do not feel this responsibility, there is no indication of who the teachers believe is responsible for meeting the unique language and curriculum needs of the LM students. Since the survey questions fall into four categories, the results for each category will be discussed rather than the results to individual questions.

Category 1: Responsibility for Curriculum and Language Adjustments

The responses to the questions concerning teachers' responsibility to make curriculum and language adjustments (see Table 2) indicate that teachers are generally undecided about their responsibility to provide LM students with English language instruction and to adjust the linguistic complexity of their instruction. Although half of the teachers (59.3%) involved in this study disagree to some extent that content teachers are responsible for providing LM students with English language instruction (question 3), 20% of these teachers firmly believe they are not responsible for providing LM students with English instruction. Thus, content teachers do not feel responsible for providing LM students with English language instruction, nor do they feel responsible for adjusting the complexity of their English language use when instructing LM students (question 4).

Nearly half (52%) of the responding teachers believe that ESL teachers and tutors alone are responsible for providing additional materials for ESL students (questions 12 and 17). When this information is considered in terms of LPP, the need for a concise outline of teachers' responsibilities regarding English language instruction emerges. In this district, outlining of responsibilities is particularly important since LM students are scheduled to attend and participate in mostly mainstream classes.

Category 2: Appropriateness of Making Adjustments

In the area of appropriateness for making language and curriculum adjustments for LM students, content teachers are uncertain in their responses. No clear consensus emerged from the responses to the statement regarding adjustments to the language complexity of tests and quizzes to meet the language proficiency of LM students (see Table 3, questions 5). As a whole, teachers are undecided about the appropriateness of adjusting linguistic complexity to meet the language level of LM students. Many teachers agree, however, that LM students should not be speaking their native language (questions 6 and 7) in either their mainstream classes (61%) or in their ESL classes (56%). Since many teachers subscribe to a language-as-problem orientation, any language-in-education policy and plan should factor in teachers' language ideologies in order to be successful. Finally, several teachers (61%) somewhat agree that any additional content instruction LM students need should occur in ESL classes *only*. This result is somewhat troubling since content teachers are responsible for teaching content regardless of a students' language proficiency or background knowledge. This leads one to wonder why teachers do not feel it appropriate for LM students to receive help with content in their academic classes. This type of result might signal to language policy planners the need to search for underlying beliefs about LM students' ability to learn.

Category 3: Social Inclusion of LM Students

Another topic addressed in the survey was teacher's willingness to increase the social inclusion of LM students by learning and teaching about other cultures as well as taking responsibility for the interaction of non-native English speaking (NNES) and native English speaking (NES) students in their classrooms. Overall, the responses (see Table 4) indicate teachers are ambivalent about their responsibility in promoting social interaction among NNES and NES students. Content teachers (62.7%) somewhat agree that they are responsible for teaching NES students about other cultures (question 8), but 62.7% of teachers marked scores near the middle of the scale indicating that they are unsure of their responsibility to teach LM students about the culture of the target language speakers (question 9). Furthermore, teachers (63.7%) are unsure of their role in learning about the various cultures of their ESL students (question 10).

Although teachers are uncertain of their responsibility to learn about other cultures, just over half of the teachers (61.1%) agree to some extent that they are responsible for helping ESL students interact with native English speaking students (question 11). Therefore, several teachers believe they are responsible for NNES and NES student interactions.

Concerning social inclusion of LM students, half of the teachers accept some degree of responsibility to help NES and NNES students interact with each other, yet most teachers are uncertain about their role in taking steps to increase the understanding of the different cultural groups. Policy planners need to be aware of teacher desire to increase social inclusion of LM students despite their uncertainty concerning effective methods for encouraging the mutual understanding between NES and NNES students.

Category 4: Obtaining Training to Teach LM Students

Sixty-two percent of the teachers agree or strongly agree that they have not been well trained to teach ESL students (see Table 5, question 14). This finding corresponds with the attitude which emerged during the administrative interviews (see Table 1). Both sources indicate that lack of sufficient training to effectively educate ESL students is a substantial problem in this school district. Even though most teachers feel they have not been sufficiently trained to work with ESL students in their content classrooms, the teachers do not overwhelmingly agree that all content teachers should be trained to work with ESL students (question 15). In fact, 34% of the teachers do not believe every content teacher should be trained. Even though this is only a third of the responding teachers, this finding can be an influential factor in the education of LM students. In terms of language policy and planning, planners must acknowledge that one-third of the secondary teachers in this district are not willing to obtain training to improve their skills in teaching ESL students.

In general, 69.5% of content teachers feel they are *not* responsible for obtaining additional ESL training (questions 16). Teachers feel that school administrators (74.3%) and district level administrators (80.8%) are responsible for providing teachers with the ESL training they need (questions 18 and 19. These findings are also meaningful when viewed in light of the importance administrators placed on training teachers in ESL as revealed during the interview with administrators (see Table 1).

It is important to note that these questions do not distinguish between time and money. In other words, some teachers may feel administrators are responsible for providing teachers with the money to obtain ESL training, while other teachers may believe administrators are accountable for freeing teachers of some additional responsibilities in order to have the time to

take ESL training classes. However, responses to these questions clearly indicate that teachers do not feel responsible for obtaining additional ESL training. Instead, they indicated that administrators are responsible for providing ESL training.

In terms of LPP, when administrators and language planners state that training all content teachers is an effective solution to their ESL needs, they must take into consideration those teachers who would resist this type of training. They must also factor into any policy decisions the strong belief that, according to the content teachers in this study, administrators are responsible for providing teachers with the time and money to obtain ESL training.

Overall, since teacher training is a concern for administrators in this district and a critical aspect of the district's current implicit language plan, it is important to understand teachers' willingness to make classroom adjustments and obtain further ESL training. According to the survey responses in this study content teachers are undecided about their role in educating LM students and the appropriateness of making linguistic adjustments in teaching and preparing testing materials. They are, however, certain LM students should not use their native languages during class. Teaches are unclear about their responsibility to provide English language instruction and additional content instruction when needed. In the area of social inclusion, many teachers indicate the need for social interactions of NNES and NES student, but Teachers are also ambivalent concerning their specific duties to increase social interaction and understanding between different cultural groups. Although teachers acknowledge their lack of ESL training, they clearly indicated that administrators are responsible for providing the time and money needed to obtain this training. As a whole, teacher responses show a lack of clear sense of ownership for meeting LM students' needs. Correlating this information with administrators' plans to train teachers reveals the need for a concise policy stating the teachers' role in language-

in-education and the personnel responsible for equipping the necessary skills and assistance to fulfill this expected role.

Conclusion

This profile of administrator and teacher ideologies and attitudes regarding LM students and issues has implications for language-in-education policy and planning. First, as the interviews conducted in this study suggest, without a language policy to guide language-in-education decisions, district administrators are persuaded by the ideologies of monolingualism and individualism when evaluating and planning the education of LM students. This implies the need for a formal language policy to steer the language objectives and plan regarding language-in-education. The results of these interviews suggest the need for all administrators to evaluate their own, as well as society's, language assumptions and the way in which these ideologies influence their views of LM students when forming language policy and plans. Administrators would benefit from training which would allow them to identify their assumptions and ideologies about language and LM students. A LPP should address administrative training as well as teacher training.

Another important suggestion indicated by the results of this study is that a language plan should address the responsibilities of teachers in terms of making curriculum and language adjustments and obtaining ESL training. Administrators commented that teachers are the key element in providing LM students with the type of instruction they need to gain access to content materials. However, the findings indicate that many teachers seem unwilling to take responsibility for the education of LM students.

Many teachers are unwilling to make the necessary language and curriculum adjustments, and the majority of teachers surveyed do not feel they have been trained to effectively instruct

LM students. The individuals responsible for meeting LM students' needs are not clearly defined, and the responsibilities for making language and curriculum adjustments are not clearly understood. Therefore, a language policy would need to clearly state who is responsible for making the necessary accommodations to improve LM students' abilities to learn language and content material. A LPP would also include a plan that would provide teachers and other individuals with the necessary training and instruction to meet such policy goals. Therefore, the LPP in this school district should address the amount of teacher training required as well as who is responsible for obtaining this training. Since many teachers are unwilling to participate in training program, the teacher training portion of the formal LPP should address ways to help teachers see the current need for ESL training and classroom adjustment in order to effectively meet the needs of the increasing LM student population.

The ideologies and teacher attitudes expressed during this study suggest the need for a language policy to guide alternative language planning. Further study concerning the influence a formal language policy would have on the ideologies of administrators and attitudes of teachers would be insightful for language policy and planners.

REFERENCES

Clair, N. (1995). Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL students. *TESOL* Quarterly, 29, 189-196.

Clegg, J. (1996). Introduction. In J. Clegg (Ed.), Mainstreaming ESL: Case studies in integrating ESL students into the mainstream curriculum (pp. 1-35, 156-178). Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Corrubias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning: International perspectives (pp. 41-85). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Dicker, S. J. (1996). Languages in America. (pp. 101-141). Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. (pp. 197-242). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Faltis, C. & Hudelson, S. (1994). Learning English as an additional language in K-12 schools. *TESOL* Quarterly, 28, 457-466.

Guinn, S. G. (1996) Elementary teachers' perception of issues relating to LEP mainstreaming. Unpublished masters thesis, Brigham Young University, 1996.

Handscombe, J. (1989). Mainstreaming: Who needs it? In J. H. Esling (Ed.), Multicultural education and policy: ESL in the 1990's (pp. 18-35). Toronto, Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hornerberger, N. & Ricento, T. K. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ESL professional. *TESOL* Quarterly, 30, 401-427

Judd, E. (1992). In W. Grabe & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), Introduction to Applied Linguistics (pp. 169-190). NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Kaplan, R. B. (1992). In W. Grabe & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), Introduction to Applied Linguistics (pp. 143-166). NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Kaplan, R. B. (1994). Language policy and planning: Fundamental issues. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14, 3-19.

Lucas, T. & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native language in English-only programs for language minority students, *TESOL* Quarterly, 28, 537-559.

McGroarty, M. (1997). Language policy in the USA: National values local loyalties, pragmatic pressures. In W. Eggington, & H. Wren (Eds.), Language Policy: English, Pluralist Challenges (pp. 401-427). Australia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle, (pp. 9-44). Philadelphia, PA: Miltilingual Matters Ltd.

Tollefson, J. (1991). Planning language, planning inequality: Language poicy in the community. London: Longman.

Wiley, T. G & Lukes, M.. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S., *TESOL* Quarterly, 30, 511-525.

Categories of Administrative Ideologies and Attitudes

Table 1

Categories and Sub-categories	Number of Respondent
1. Training for Educating LM Students	
a. lack of teacher training	2, 5, 6
b. current plan to train teachers	1, 3, 5
c. administrative training	
no training	1, 3, 4, 5
some training	2, 6
training not effective	4, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 6
2. Teacher Willingness to Work with LM Students	2, 4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 4
3. Social Concerns in Educating LM Students	2, 3, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 4
4. Concern for LM Students' Academic Progress	4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 3
5. Family Choices Influence LM Students' Education	3, 4, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 3
6. Educating LM Students is a Difficult Reality	1, 2, 4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 5
7. Legal Obligations to Educate LM Students	1, 3, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 4
8. Lack of Formal Language Policy	
a. no district language policy	1, 2, 3, 4, 6
b. increase of individual influence without formal policy	2, 3, 5, 6
c. current language plan	4, 5, 6
d. no state language policy	1
e. agree with state policy	1, 6
f. distrust state in regards to language policy	3, 4
	Total Respondents for Category = 6
9. Affects of LM Student Population Size	1, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 2
10. Community's Feelings	
a. unaware of LM students	1, 2, 5, 6
b. unwilling to accept large amounts of money spent on ESL program	1
c. religion and money are more influential than minority language status	3
	Total Respondents for Category = 5
11. LM Students in Mainstream Classrooms	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 6
12. LM Students are an Asset/Value	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 6
13. Native Language Interference with English Acquisition	1, 3, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 3
14. Schools not Responsible for Native Language Maintenance	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 6
15. Reasons for Varied Academic Success of LM Students	
a. existing academic ability	1, 2, 5, 6
b. LM students' native culture	4, 6
c. personality	1
d. socioeconomic status	5
e. family value of education	3
f. vary like NES students	2, 6
	Total Respondents for Category = 6

Table 2

Responses to Question 3

Content teachers are responsible for providing ESL students with English language instruction.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.28
M=5

	1	2	3	4	X	6	7	8
# Responses	6	2	11	5	7	11	5	12
% Responses	10.2%	3.4%	18.6%	8.5%	11.9%	18.6%	8.5%	20.3%

Responses to Question 4

Content teachers are responsible for adjusting the language complexity of instruction in order to meet ESL students' language level when ESL student(s) are in the classroom.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.33
M=4.44

	1	2	3	4	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	8	5	10	11	4	5	8	8	
% Responses	13.6%	8.5%	16.9%	18.6%	6.8%	8.5%	13.6%	13.6%	

Responses to Question 12

ESL teachers or tutors are responsible for providing content teachers with supplementary materials for ESL students.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.09
M=2.93

	1	2	X3	4	5	6	7	8
# Responses	20	11	7	8	5	3	2	3
% Responses	33.9%	18.6%	11.9%	13.6%	8.5%	5.1%	3.4%	5.1%

Responses to Question 17

Content teachers are responsible for obtaining supplementary materials for ESL students.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.53
M=5.62

	1	2	3	4	5	X	6	7	8
# Responses	4	2	7	4	8		5	14	13
% Responses	6.9%	3.4%	12.1%	6.9%	13.8%		8.6%	24.1%	22.4%

Table 3

Responses to Question 5

Content teachers should adjust the language level of assignments and test/quizzes to meet ESL students' language abilities.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.30
M=4.42

	1	2	3	4	X 5	6	7	8
# Responses	7	8	9	7	7	5	10	6
% Responses	11.9%	13.6%	15.3%	11.9%	11.9%	8.5%	16.9%	10.2%

Responses to Question 6

Content teachers should allow ESL students to speak their native language(s) during content class.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.34
M=5.08

	1	2	3	4	5X	6	7	8
# Responses	6	7	1	9	7	8	10	11
% Responses	10.2%	11.9%	1.7%	15.3%	11.9%	13.6%	16.9%	18.6%

Responses to Question 7

ESL teachers and tutors should allow ESL students to speak their native language(s) during ESL class.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.30
M=4.78

	1	2	3	4	X 5	6	7	8
# Responses	7	6	5	8	6	11	8	8
% Responses	11.9%	10.2%	8.5%	13.6%	10.2%	18.6%	13.6%	13.6%

Responses to Question 13

ESL students should receive the additional content instruction they may need to catch up to their peers only during ESL classes.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.00
M=4.24

	1	2	3	4 X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	6	5	11	14	8	4	7	4
% Responses	10.2%	8.5%	18.6%	23.7%	13.6%	6.8%	11.9%	6.8%

Table 4

Responses to Question 8

Content teachers are responsible for instructing native English speaking students about other cultures.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.23
M=4.0

	1	2	3	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	9	8	10	10	8	5	1	8
% Responses	15.3%	13.6%	16.9%	16.9%	13.6%	8.5%	1.7%	13.6%

Responses to Question 9

Content teachers should instruct ESL students about Utah's English speaking culture.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.04
M=4.20

	1	2	3	4	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	6	7	9	13		10	5	3	6
% Responses	10.2%	11.9%	15.3%	22.0%		16.9%	8.5%	5.1%	10.2%

Responses to Question 10

Content teachers are responsible for learning about the culture of ESL students.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.16
M=4.41

	1	2	3	4	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	7	3	12	9		10	6	3	8
% Responses	12.1%	5.2%	20.7%	15.5%		17.2%	10.3%	5.2%	13.8%

Responses to Question 11

It is the responsibility of content teachers to help ESL students interact socially with native English speaking students.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.26
M=4.03

	1	2	3	4	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	9	8	12	7		6	6	5	6
% Responses	15.3%	13.6%	20.3%	11.9%		10.2%	10.2%	8.5%	10.2%

Table 5

Responses to Question 14

I feel I have been well trained for teaching ESL students.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.05
M=6.34

	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	7	8
# Responses	2	3	3	3	4	7		13	24
% Responses	3.4%	5.1%	5.1%	5.1%	6.8%	11.9%		22.0%	40.7%

Responses to Question 15

Every content teacher, not just ESL personnel, should attend ESL training classes.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.13
M=4.10

	1	2	3	4	X	5	6	7	8
# Responses	6	7	15	11		7	1	4	8
% Responses	10.2%	11.9%	25.4%	18.6%		11.9%	1.7%	6.8%	13.6%

Responses to Question 16

Content teachers are responsible for obtaining ESL training.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.13
M=5.56

	1	2	3	4	5	X	6	7	8
# Responses	2	5	3	8	11		7	6	17
% Responses	3.4%	8.5%	5.1%	13.6%	18.6%		11.9%	10.2%	28.8%

Responses to Question 18

School administrators are responsible for providing content teachers with the time and money to attend ESL training.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.53
M=3.14

	1	2	3	X	4	5	6	7	8
# Responses	21	12	7		2	3	2	2	8
% Responses	36.8%	21.1%	12.9%		3.5%	5.3%	3.5%	3.5%	14.0%

Responses to Question 19

District administrators are responsible for providing content teachers with the time and money to attend ESL training.

Strongly Agree ***Strongly Disagree***

SD=2.37
M=2.61

	1	2	X	3	4	5	6	7	8
# Responses	28	12		5	1	2	0	4	5
% Responses	49.1%	21.1%		8.8%	1.8%	3.5%	NA	7.0%	8.8%